

THIS OPINION WAS NOT WRITTEN FOR PUBLICATION

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 22

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte SERGIO KOSTEK, SHU-KONG CHANG,
GORDON McDANIEL, THOMAS PLONA and CURTIS RANDALL

Appeal No. 95-1276
Application 07/839,969¹

HEARD: April 7, 1997

Before McCANDLISH, Senior Administrative Patent Judge, STAAB and
CRAWFORD, Administrative Patent Judges.

CRAWFORD, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on an appeal from the examiner's final rejection of claims 21-87, which are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-20 have been canceled.

¹ Application for patent filed February 20, 1992. According to appellants, this application is a continuation-in-part of application 07/548,169 filed July 5, 1990, which is a continuation-in-part of application 07/288,742 filed December 22, 1988, both abandoned.

Appeal No. 95-1276
Application 07/839,969

Appellants' invention is directed to a method for performing logging while drilling with a hollow drill string having a drill bit at its lower end. Claim 80 is illustrative of the claims on appeal and recites:

80. A method for performing sonic logging while drilling a borehole traversing an earth formation, including drilling the borehole with a drill string having a drill bit at its lower end and drilling fluid in the borehole surrounding the drill string, the steps comprising:

a) drilling with a drill collar incorporated into the drill string;

b) transmitting, from a location on said drill collar, acoustic energy into the surrounding earth formations;

c) receiving, at a location on said drill collar, acoustic energy returned from the surrounding earth formations;

d) providing an output related to the received acoustic energy; and

e) determining from said output a characteristic of said earth formations.

THE REFERENCE

The following references were relied on by the examiner to support the final rejection:

Ely	2,757,358	July 31, 1956
Moser et al. (Moser)	3,190,388	June 22, 1965
Schuster	3,191,141	June 22, 1965
Cox et al. (Cox)	4,293,936	Oct. 6, 1981
Kent et al. (Kent)	4,302,826	Nov. 24, 1981
Lygas	4,636,999	Jan. 13, 1987
Hoyle et al. (Hoyle)	4,850,450	July 25, 1989

Appeal No. 95-1276
Application 07/839,969

Lord et al. (Lord), Materials Evaluation, Volume 35, No. 11, pages 49-54, November 1977.

THE REJECTION

Claims 21-87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 "as being unpatentable over Lygas or Kent et al when taken with Lord or Cox et al, and Ely (US Patent) and Hoyle et al, or Schuster or Moser et al." (Final Rejection at page 2).²

Rather than reiterate the respective positions of the examiner and the appellants in support of their respective positions, reference is made to the examiner's answer (Paper No. 14) and the appellants' brief (Paper No. 12) for the full exposition thereof.

OPINION

We have carefully reviewed the appellants' invention as described in the specification, the appealed claims, the prior

² By our count, the examiner's uses of the word "or" in the statement of the rejection results in no less than 12 different and distinct possible combinations of references. It is questionable whether this circumstance fulfills the examiner's basic duty to clearly inform applicants of the evidentiary basis of the rejection. In this instance, however, we decline to remand the present application to the examiner for clarification since the explanation of the rejection found in the body of the answer clarifies the manner in which the references are applied to the degree necessary for us to decide the obviousness issues raised in this appeal on the merits.

art applied by the examiner, and the respective positions advanced by appellants in the brief and the examiner in the answer. As a consequence of this review, we conclude that the rejections of the examiner should not be sustained.

Independent claim 80 calls for, inter alia, the step of receiving, at a location on the drill collar, acoustic energy returned from the surrounding earth formations.

Considering first the rejection based on the use of Lygas as the primary reference, Lygas discloses a method for performing logging while drilling a borehole traversing an earth formation, including drilling the borehole with a drill string 13 having a drill bit 14 at its lower end and drilling fluid in the borehole surrounding the drill string (Fig. 1; Col. 1, lines 15-18; Col. 3, lines 22-25; Col. 8, line 19). The method steps include drilling with a data handling sub 15 incorporated into the drill string 13. Lygas also discloses that the acoustic signals penetrate the walls of the borehole and enable analysis of sub-terranean formations ahead of the bit and thus at least suggest the presence of a receiver (Col. 1, lines 15-28). However, Lygas is silent about the location of a receiver.

The examiner states that measurement of formations ahead of the drill bit is usually accomplished by keeping the

adjacent receivers in the data handling sub so as not to be subject to interference by the weathering layer and other strata between the data handling sub and the earth's surface (Answer at page 11). However, the examiner does not have a factual basis for this statement.

A rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 103 must rest on a factual basis, with the facts being interpreted without hindsight reconstruction of the invention from the prior art. In making this evaluation, the examiner has the initial duty of supplying the factual basis for the rejection he advances. He may not, because he doubts that the invention is patentable, resort to speculation, unfounded assumptions or hindsight reconstruction to supply deficiencies in the factual basis. See In re Warner, 379 F.2d 1011, 1017, 154 USPQ 173, 178 (CCPA 1967).

As such it is the examiner's duty to establish a factual basis for concluding that Lygas teaches or suggests the placement of the receiver in the data handling sub. The examiner has not met this burden. We have reviewed the disclosures of Lord, Cox, Ely, Hoyle, Schuster and Moser but these references do not cure the deficiencies of Lygas in this regard. For example, while Cox, Ely, Hoyle, Schuster and Moser disclose downhole logging tools which include transmitters and receivers, these

references do not disclose tools which are utilized during drilling.

In view of the foregoing, we will not sustain the examiner's rejection of claim 80 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on the use of Lygas as a primary reference. As each of the independent method claims recite a step of receiving an acoustic signal at a location on the drill collar and each of the independent apparatus claims recite that the receiver is mounted on a drill collar, we also will not sustain the rejection of claims 21-79 and 81-87 based on the use of Lygas as a primary reference.

We now turn to the rejection of the pending claims based on the use of Kent as the primary reference. Kent discloses a transducer for coupling an acoustic signal to a borehole drilling string during drilling. A sensor is mounted in the borehole in a sub-unit 38 which is adapted to generate an electrical measure of data relating to the operation of drill bit 40 such as fluid pressure or temperature (Col. 3, lines 7-10). The output from this sensor modulates an acoustic transmitter and the resultant acoustic wave is propagated toward the earth's surface along the drill string 35 (Col. 3, lines 6-28) where it is received by a receiver mounted in a sub unit 32 at the earth's

surface. As such Kent does not disclose the steps of both transmitting signals and receiving signals at the drill collar, as recited in claim 80.

The examiner argues, in effect, that although Kent depicts the transmitter 37 and receiver 32 mounted at the earth's surface, this does not detract from the teaching of mounting receivers on drill collars for receiving acoustic energy (Answer at page 11). The examiner has presented no convincing argument why this is so, and none is apparent to us. Clearly Kent does not disclose, teach or suggest the placement of the receiver on the collar on which the transmitter is disposed. We have again reviewed the disclosures of Lord, Cox, Ely, Hoyle, Schuster and Moser as they relate to Kent, but have found nothing in these references that would have motivated a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus disclosed in Kent so that the receiving step takes place at the drill collar, where the transmitting step takes place. In view of the foregoing, we will not sustain the rejection of claim 80 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on the use of Kent as a primary reference. As each of the independent method claims recite a step of receiving an emitted acoustic signal at a location on the drill collar and each of the independent apparatus claims recite that

Appeal No. 95-1276
Application 07/839,969

the receiver is mounted on a drill collar, we also will not sustain the rejection as to claims 21-79 and 81-87 based on the use of Kent as the primary reference.

The decision of the examiner is reversed.

REVERSED

)	
HARRISON E. McCANDLISH, Senior)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	
)	
)	
)	BOARD OF PATENT
LAWRENCE J. STAAB)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	APPEALS AND
)	
)	INTERFERENCES
)	
MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD)	
Administrative Patent Judge)	

Appeal No. 95-1276
Application 07/839,969

RYBERG JOHN JEFFREY
SCHLUMBERGER, LTD.
200 Macco Blv.
Sugarland, TX 77478